



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,608	04/17/2006	Daniel Migault	33155.33	7650
7590 04/08/2009				
Gerald E Helget Briggs and Morgan Suite 2200 80 South Eight Street Minneapolis, MN 55402			EXAMINER KIM, EDWARD J	
			ART UNIT 2455	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 04/08/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/572,608

Applicant(s)

MIGAULT, DANIEL

Examiner

EDWARD J. KIM

Art Unit

2455

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 January 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed on 01/27/2009.
2. Claims 1-7 are pending in this office action. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended.

Response to Amendment

3. The Examiner provides additional new art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shelest et al. (US Patent #7,299,491 B2), in view of CERT Coordination Center ("Securing an Internet Name Server", copyright 2002 Carnegie Mellon University, Aug. 2002, Allen Householder, Brian King, Ken Silva, Cricket Lie), in further view of Masset et al. ("Deploying DNS Security", May 28, 2003).

Shelest discloses methods, systems, and computer program products for resolving domain name system records based on client authentication.

Regarding claim 1, a telecommunications system comprising a reference server connected to at least one terminal by means of a communication network, said reference server

further comprising a database comprising data associated with at least one domain name (Shelest, Abstract, col.1 ln.12-15, col.2 ln.28-35), and said system comprising at least one first and one secondary auxiliary server containing data previously recorded within said database of said reference server (Shelest, figure 4, col.2 ln.35-39, col.8 ln.27-35) and respectively provided with first and second authorization access levels (Shelest, figure 4, col.4 ln.15-23, ln.35-40, ln.44-47, 51-65, col.7 ln.9-20). Shelest discloses servers, which have different levels/types of access restriction.), at least one of the first and second auxiliary servers being provided with identification means for preventing any access to the data that it contains by terminals not having access authorization compatible with the authorization access level attributed to the data contained in this auxiliary server (Shelest, figure 4, col.4 ln.15-23, ln.35-40, ln.44-47, 51-65, col.7 ln.9-20).

Although Shelest suggests other servers that contain data previously recorded within the database of a reference server (Shelest, figure 4, col.2 ln.35-39, col.8 ln.27-35), Shelest fails to explicitly disclose, said data in the first and second auxiliary servers previously recorded within said database of said reference server further comprising data issued from said reference server, and wherein said data issued from said reference server are spread over said first and second auxiliary servers relative to said first and second authorization access levels. Massey et al. discloses deployment of DNS security. Massey et al. further discloses Caching DNS servers, wherein the Caching DNS servers caches and saves data from other DNS servers and further discloses security measures implemented on DNS servers, such as DNSSEC (Massey et al., slides 3-11). CERT Coordination Center discloses a system and method for securing an Internet Name Server. CERT Coordination Center further discloses the current risks on the Internet, and

provides couple of solutions such as “Use separate servers” and “Filter traffic to your name server” (CERT Coordination Center, pg.4-5). “Use separate servers” method suggests creation of more than one server, wherein the information that is normally on one server is distributed according to the criteria disclosed, and “Filter traffic to your name server” discloses various filtering methods for improving the security of the name servers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Shelest with those of Massey et al. and CERT Coordination Center to implement different authorization access levels to the plurality of servers, wherein the plurality of servers include data that is normally stored in one server (reference server). One would have been motivated to do so to solve the problem of security of name servers on the Internet.

Regarding claim 2, Shelest disclosed the limitations, as described in claim 1, and further discloses a telecommunication system comprised in that the database is provided with means of duplicating the data contained in the reference server to the first and second auxiliary servers according to the authorization access levels attributed to the said data (Shelest, figure 4, col.2 ln.35-39, col.8 ln.27-35, col.4 ln.15-23, ln.35-40, ln.44-47, 51-65, col.7 ln.9-20).

Regarding claim 3, Shelest disclosed the limitations, as described in claim 1, and further discloses, a telecommunication system comprised in that first and second auxiliary servers are provided with identification means to prevent any access to the data contained in the first and second auxiliary servers by terminals not having access authorizations respectively compatible with the first and second authorization access levels (Shelest, figure 4, col.4 ln.15-23, ln.35-40, ln.44-47, 51-65, col.7 ln.9-20, col.2 ln.35-39, col.8 ln.27-35).

Regarding claim 4, Shelest disclosed the limitations, as described in claim 1, and further discloses, a telecommunications system comprised in that the reference server is provided with identification means for preventing of any reading of data contained in the said reference server from terminals not having access authorization compatible with the third authorization access levels (Shelest, figure 4, col.4 ln.15-23, ln.35-40, ln.44-47, 51-65, col.7 ln.9-20, col.2 ln.35-39, col.8 ln.27-35).

Regarding claim 5, Shelest disclosed the limitations, as described in claim 1, and further discloses, a telecommunications system comprised in that the third authorization access levels has a restrictive effect greater than the restrictive effects produced by the first and second authorization access levels (Shelest, figure 4, col.4 ln.15-23, ln.35-40, ln.44-47, 51-65, col.7 ln.9-20, col.2 ln.35-39, col.8 ln.27-35).

Regarding claim 6, Shelest disclosed the limitations, as described in claim 1, and further discloses, a telecommunication system comprised in that the reference server is provided with identification means for preventing any writing of data in the said reference server from a terminal not having access authorization compatible with an authorization access level having a restrictive effect greater than the restrictive effect produced by all the other authorization access levels attributed to the data contained in the reference server and the auxiliary servers (Shelest, figure 4, col.4 ln.15-23, ln.35-40, ln.44-47, 51-65, col.7 ln.9-20, col.2 ln.35-39, col.8 ln.27-35).

Regarding claim 7, Shelest discloses a device for storing information comprising a reference server and at least a first and second auxiliary server containing data previously recorded within the reference server and respectively provided with a first and second authorization access level, at least one of the first and second auxiliary servers being provided

with identification means for preventing any access to the data that they contain by applicants not having access authorization compatible with the authorization access level attributed to the data contained in this auxiliary server (Shelest, figure 4, col.4 ln.15-23, ln.35-40, ln.44-47, 51-65, col.7 ln.9-20, col.2 ln.35-39, col.8 ln.27-35).

Although Shelest suggests other servers that contain data previously recorded within the database of a reference server (Shelest, figure 4, col.2 ln.35-39, col.8 ln.27-35), Shelest fails to explicitly disclose, said data in the first and second auxiliary servers previously recorded within said database of said reference server further comprising data issued from said reference server, and wherein said data issued from said reference server are spread over said first and second auxiliary servers relative to said first and second authorization access levels. Massey et al. discloses deployment of DNS security. Massey et al. further discloses Caching DNS servers, wherein the Caching DNS servers caches and saves data from other DNS servers and further discloses security measures implemented on DNS servers, such as DNSSEC (Massey et al., slides 3-11). CERT Coordination Center discloses a system and method for securing an Internet Name Server. CERT Coordination Center further discloses the current risks on the Internet, and provides couple of solutions such as "Use separate servers" and "Filter traffic to your name server" (CERT Coordination Center, pg.4-5). "Use separate servers" method suggests creation of more than one server, wherein the information that is normally on one server is distributed according to the criteria disclosed, and "Filter traffic to your name server" discloses various filtering methods for improving the security of the name servers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Shelest with those of Massey et al. and CERT Coordination Center to implement different

authorization access levels to the plurality of servers, wherein the plurality of servers include data that is normally stored in one server (reference server). One would have been motivated to do so to solve the problem of security of name servers on the Internet.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

The prior art made of record and not relied up on is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Refer to form PTO-892.

A Shortened statutory period for reply is set to expire 3 month(s) or thirty (30) days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward J. Kim whose telephone number is (571) 270-3228. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30am - 5:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Edward J Kim/
Examiner, Art Unit 2455

/saleh najjar/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2455